



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/915,052	07/25/2001	Edwin Shoffner	SHO01	6105

7590

12/14/2004

Douglas W. Kim
FLINT & KIM, P.A.
P.O. Box 10827
Greenville, SC 29603

EXAMINER

ROSEN, NICHOLAS D

ART UNIT PAPER NUMBER

3625

DATE MAILED: 12/14/2004

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No. 09/915,052	Applicant(s) SHOFFNER, EDWIN	
	Examiner Nicholas D. Rosen	Art Unit 3625	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 25 July 2001.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-20 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-20 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☒ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 25 July 2001 is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☒ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 2) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152) |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

DETAILED ACTION

Claims 1-20 have been examined.

Drawings

The drawings are objected to as failing to comply with 37 CFR 1.84(p)(4) because reference character "68" has been used to designate both the communications means in Figure 4 and a step in the flow chart of Figure 7. Corrected drawing sheets in compliance with 37 CFR 1.121(d) are required in reply to the Office action to avoid abandonment of the application. Any amended replacement drawing sheet should include all of the figures appearing on the immediate prior version of the sheet, even if only one figure is being amended. The replacement sheet(s) should be labeled "Replacement Sheet" in the page header (as per 37 CFR 1.84(c)) so as not to obstruct any portion of the drawing figures. If the changes are not accepted by the examiner, the applicant will be notified and informed of any required corrective action in the next Office action. The objection to the drawings will not be held in abeyance.

The drawings are objected to as failing to comply with 37 CFR 1.84(p)(5) because they include the following reference character(s) not mentioned in the description: steps 66 and 68 from the flowchart in Figure 7 appear not to be mentioned in the description, although, confusingly, the written description does refer to "means of communication 66 (Figure 4)" on page 16, line 22, and "network connection 68 (Figure 4)" on page 17, line 13. Corrected drawing sheets in compliance with 37 CFR 1.121(d), or amendment to the specification to add the reference character(s) in the description in

Art Unit: 3625

compliance with 37 CFR 1.121(b) are required in reply to the Office action to avoid abandonment of the application. Any amended replacement drawing sheet should include all of the figures appearing on the immediate prior version of the sheet, even if only one figure is being amended. The replacement sheet(s) should be labeled "Replacement Sheet" in the page header (as per 37 CFR 1.84(c)) so as not to obstruct any portion of the drawing figures. If the changes are not accepted by the examiner, the applicant will be notified and informed of any required corrective action in the next Office action. The objection to the drawings will not be held in abeyance.

Examiner suggests relabeling the communications means in Figure 4 with a number not in use elsewhere, such as "97," and referring to this consistently at page 16, line 22, and page 17, line 13, as well as inserting references in the written specification to steps 66 and 68 in Figure 7.

Specification

The disclosure is objected to because of the following informalities: On page 13, line 10, "firm of soft" should be "firm or soft". See also remarks above, regarding the written specification's failures to correspond to the drawings.

Appropriate correction is required.

Claim Objections

Claims 1-9 are objected to because of the following informalities: In the twenty-second line of claim 1 (line 23 on page 20), "a desirable product criteria" should be

either “desirable product criteria” or “a desirable product criterion,” since criteria is the plural of criterion. Later uses of “criteria” should be consistent. Also, in the fourth line of claim 1, there should be a comma after “personnel.” Appropriate correction is required.

Claims 3-7 are objected to because of the following informalities: In the second line of claim 3, “a set of purchasing instruction” should be “a set of purchasing instructions”. Appropriate correction is required.

Claim 16 is objected to because of the following informalities: In the second line of claim 16, “an call center” should be “a call center”. Appropriate correction is required.

Claim 20 is objected to because of the following informalities: In the third line of claim 20, “a remotely located sales personnel” should be either “a remotely located salesperson” or “remotely located sales personnel”. Appropriate correction is required.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 1-9

Claims 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, and 8 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Anderson (“Personal Selling and Sales Management in the New Millennium”) in view of Wernle (“The New Deal [Used-Car Superstores in Detroit’s Automotive-Retail Market Will Ring the Death Knell for Traditional Mom-and-Pop Auto

Dealerships”)), Green et al. (U.S. Patent 6,041,310), and official notice. As per claim 1, Anderson discloses an integrated, interactive display, sales, and delivery system allowing for automated demonstrations, product selections, and purchases by a customer of offered goods without the necessity of the physical presence of sales personnel, comprising: an interactive computing device located at a dealership (paragraph beginning, “Computer salespeople,” page 11 on printout). Anderson does not expressly disclose a showroom floor area, and a plurality of goods representing the available goods for sale located within said showroom floor area, said samples having selection characteristics, but Anderson does disclose computer stations at car dealerships, and official notice is taken that it is well known for car and other dealerships to have showroom floor areas with a plurality of samples of goods representing the available goods for sale within said showroom floor area, said samples having selection characteristics. Hence, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art of electronic commerce at the time of applicant’s invention for the system to comprise a showroom floor area and a plurality of samples of goods, for the obvious advantage of enabling customers to directly observe and interact with the goods, which they may then wish to purchase.

Anderson does not expressly disclose that the interactive computing device includes or communicates with a showroom computer readable medium, an input device, and a processor, but official notice is taken that it is well known computers to have computer readable media, input devices (e.g., keyboards, computer mice, etc.), and processors. Hence, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art of

electronic commerce at the time of applicant's invention for the system to comprise a showroom computer readable medium, an input device, and a processor, for the obvious advantage of enabling the interactive computing device to carry out its disclosed functions.

Anderson discloses computer stations that can, "compare features of competitive models," implying a goods database containing records representing goods available for sale, product information, and selection characteristics associated with said goods. Anderson does not disclose that the goods database also contains association information associating at least one good available for sale with at least one of the samples of goods located within the showroom floor area, but Wernle teaches a goods database associating at least one good available for sale with at least one good available on a car lot (paragraph beginning, "The superstores want to eliminate"). Hence, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art of electronic commerce at the time of applicant's invention to have the goods database include association information associating at least one good available for sale with at least one of the samples of goods located within the showroom floor area, for the obvious advantage of assisting a customer in finding an actual product for examination and possible purchase.

Anderson does not expressly disclose a set of selection instructions contained within a showroom computer readable medium for performing the tasks of querying the customer to determine desirable product criteria of the customer, receiving said desirable product criteria from the customer via the input device, and creating a

Art Unit: 3625

hierarchy of preferred goods for sale according to said desirable product criteria and selection characteristics, and presenting the most preferred good for sale from a goods database to the customer, but Green teaches this (column 7, line 25, through column 11, line 65; Figures 6 through 12). (Green does not emphasize presenting the most preferred good, but the most preferred good is presumably included among the at least one car presented in Green's system; furthermore, the at least one might be exactly one.) Hence, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art of electronic commerce at the time of applicant's invention to have instructions causing the computing device to carry out these procedures, for the stated advantage (column 2) of assisting a customer in sifting through the myriad choices available for a car purchase.

Green teaches inviting a customer to physically evaluate at least one of the samples of goods (column 12, lines 13-15), but does not teach including a result of the physical evaluation into the desirable product criteria if performed by the customer. However, Anderson, Wernle, and Green all pertain to showrooms with goods on display (presumably, in the case of Anderson), so it would be easy and natural for a customer to engage in physical evaluation (look at cars, kick the tires, note the size of various vehicles, check that they were free of rust, etc.), and include a result of the physical evaluation into the desirable product criteria (e.g., by including or excluding a category including a particular vehicle one had seen). Moreover, the claim language only recites including a result of the physical evaluation into the desirable product criteria if performed by the customer, not requiring the customer to perform such a physical evaluation; also, it is the customer who chooses what product criteria are desirable to

him, making this use not really a limitation of the system. Hence, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art of electronic commerce at the time of applicant's invention to invite a customer to physically evaluate at least one of the samples of goods, and include a result of the physical evaluation into the desirable product criteria if performed by the customer, for the obvious advantage of assisting customers in selecting the product or products which best suit their desires.

As per claim 2, Anderson does not expressly disclose including a video attractor for providing advertising material to potential customers of the goods offered for sale represented by said samples on said showroom floor, but official notice is taken that video displays for providing advertising material and attracting potential customers are well known. Hence, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art of electronic commerce at the time of applicant's invention to have the system include a video attractor, for the obvious advantage of attracting potential customers and increasing sales.

As per claim 3, Anderson discloses a computer automatically writing up an order and phoning it in without the intervention of a human salesperson, after the computer compares features of competitive models, etc., which implies receiving an order for the most desirable good presented to the customer, and presenting an amount due to the customer; and thus discloses transmitting an order record to a call center for having the order record processed (paragraph beginning, "Computer Salespeople"). Anderson discloses calculating the operating costs of a customer's car versus the cost of owning a new one, which would scarcely be possible with receiving customer information; also

phoning in the order would not plausibly be done without receiving customer information, such as identification indicating who the customer is, and indicating his credit card number or bank account number, or enabling his credit rating to be verified. Hence, Anderson implies receiving customer information.

Anderson does not expressly disclose receiving payment information via the input device, but official notice is taken that it is well known to receive payment information for the purchase of goods via input devices. Hence, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art of electronic commerce at the time of applicant's invention to receive payment information via the input device, for the obvious advantage of enabling an order to be taken with reasonable confidence that payment would be made.

Likewise, official notice is taken that it is well known to process payment information in creating an order; writing up and phoning in an order, as Anderson discloses, strongly suggests processing payment information to create an order record. Hence, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art of electronic commerce at the time of applicant's invention to process the payment information to create an order record, for the obvious advantage of being paid for the goods one was selling.

Anderson does not expressly disclose having the purchased good sent to the customer, but discloses phoning an order in to the factory, which implies that the purchased good is sent from the factory, and therefore sent to the customer, either directly, or via a local dealership where the customer picks it up.

As per claim 4, Anderson does not disclose a card reader for receiving payment information from the customer according to said amount due presented to the customer, but official notice is taken that card readers for receiving payment information from customers from customers according to an amount due presented to the customers is well known. Hence, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art of electronic commerce at the time of applicant's invention to have the system include a card reader for receiving payment information from the customer according to said amount due presented to the customer, for the obvious advantage of conveniently arranging payment.

As per claim 5, Anderson does not disclose a call center server having a call center processor, a call center computer readable medium, and a call center network connection, but official notice is taken that server computers are well known, and that computers normally have processors, and instructions embodied in a computer-readable medium, and that it is well known for computers, and server computers in particular, to have network connections; and yet further that it is well known to generate delivery information containing product, shipping, and customer information, and transmit the delivery information to a distribution center (shop, warehouse, etc.). Hence, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art of electronic commerce at the time of applicant's invention to include the server, with its features, and to generate and transmit delivery information, for the obvious advantage of enabling orders to be delivered, thus encouraging future sales and avoiding prosecution for fraud.

As per claim 6, Anderson does not disclose a distribution center distinct from the factory and the dealership, but official notice is taken that such distribution centers (e.g., warehouses, wholesalers) are well known. Similarly, Anderson does not disclose a distribution center server with a processor, a computer readable medium, and a network connection, but official notice is taken that server computers are well known, and that computers normally have processors, and instructions embodied in a computer-readable medium, and that it is well known for computers, and server computers in particular, to have network connections. Anderson does not disclose a physical inventory and an inventory database embodied in the distribution center computer readable medium, representing the available goods to be sold at the distribution center, and containing inventory information representing the physical inventory contained within the distribution center, but official notice is taken that it is well known for distribution centers to have physical inventories, and corresponding inventory databases. Official notice is further taken that receiving delivery information, generating pick lists, and adjusting inventory information is well known, standard procedure. Hence, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art of electronic commerce at the time of applicant's invention to include a distribution center with inventory, a corresponding inventory database, a computer, and distribution instructions for carrying out the tasks of receiving delivery information, generating pick lists, and adjusting inventory information, as recited, for the obvious advantage of conveniently arranging for purchasers to receive the goods they had ordered; and maintaining an accurate and up-to-date database of inventory, for such purposes as determining

whether orders can be filled, adjusting production to increase the supply of items in demand, etc.

As per claim 8, Anderson does not expressly disclose that the system includes a telephone contained within the showroom floor in communication with a call center so that the customer can orally communicate with the call center concerning the goods offered for sale, displayed on said showroom floor, or ordered, but does disclose phoning in an order to the factory without the intervention of a human salesperson, implying such a telephone. In any event, official notice is taken that telephones are well known, and can be put to a variety of intended purposes, such as letting a customer communicate with a call center. Hence, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art of electronic commerce at the time of applicant's invention to have the system include a telephone contained within the showroom floor in communication with a call center, for the stated advantage of enabling orders to be placed, and the obvious advantage of facilitating other communication regarding purchases.

Claim 7 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Anderson, Wernle, Green, and official notice as applied to claim 5 above, and further in view of Hanzek (U.S. Patent 6,654,726). Anderson does not disclose a call center database and a set of instructions that, when processed by the call center processor, perform the task of receiving an order information request via a network connection, the request having an order inquiry ID, retrieving the order information from the database according to the order information request ID, and presenting the order status information to the requestor via the connection, but Hanzek teaches this (Abstract;

Art Unit: 3625

column 3, line 31, through column 4, line 10; column 12, line 38, through column 13, line 10; column 25, line 46, through column 26, line 36; Figure 28). Hence, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art of electronic commerce at the time of applicant's invention to include these features, for the stated advantage (Hanzek, column 2, lines 37-53) of minimizing the risk that a customer will become inconvenienced and dissatisfied with a merchant's ordering service.

Claim 9 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Anderson, Wernle, Green, and official notice as applied to claim 8 above, and further in view of Pugliese et al. (U.S. Patent Application Publication 2001/0044751). Anderson does not disclose a network connection or video camera, but Pugliese teaches a computer network connection in communication with a call center (the merchant's location being definable as a call center); and a video camera contained within a store and connected to a network connection, such that a customer is allowed to interact with the call center through real-time video and audio communications allowing the tasks performed by the customer to be directed by personnel at the call center (Abstract; paragraphs 8 and 10). Given Pugliese's disclosure of the use of a video camera and audio-video communication, receiving a video signal from said video camera, formatting the signal for transmission, and transmitting the signal are held to be inherent, and use of a set of communications instructions embodied in a computer readable medium is held to be obvious, for the purpose of enabling the computer to perform its disclosed functions. Hence, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art of electronic commerce at the time of applicant's invention to include a computer network

connection, and a video camera, for the advantage, as taught by Pugliese (paragraph 8, of interacting with the shopper in a user-friendly way, thus, one may conclude, increasing sales.

Claims 10-18

Claims 10, 11, 12, 13, 14, 15, and 17 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Anderson ("Personal Selling and Sales Management in the New Millennium") in view of Wernle ("The New Deal [Used-Car Superstores in Detroit's Automotive-Retail Market Will Ring the Death Knell for Traditional Mom-and-Pop Auto Dealerships]"), Green et al. (U.S. Patent 6,041,310), and official notice. As per claim 10, claim 10 is essentially parallel to claim 1, and rejected on essentially the same grounds.

As per claim 11, claim 11 is essentially parallel to claim 2, and rejected on essentially the same grounds.

As per claim 12, claim 12 is essentially parallel to claim 3, and rejected on essentially the same grounds.

As per claim 13, claim 13 is essentially parallel to claim 4, and rejected on essentially the same grounds.

As per claim 14, claim 14 is essentially parallel to claim 5 (differing in being broader), and rejected on essentially the same grounds.

As per claim 15, claim 15 is essentially parallel to claim 6, and rejected on essentially the same grounds.

As per claim 17, claim 17 is essentially parallel to claim 8, and rejected on essentially the same grounds.

Claim 16 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Anderson, Wernle, Green, and official notice as applied to claim 15 above, and further in view of Hanzek (U.S. Patent 6,654,726). Claim 16 is essentially parallel to claim 7, and rejected on essentially the same grounds.

Claim 18 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Anderson, Wernle, Green, and official notice as applied to claim 17 above, and further in view of Pugliese et al. (U.S. Patent Application Publication 2001/0044751). Claim 18 is essentially parallel to claim 9 (differing in being broader), and rejected on essentially the same grounds.

Claims 19 and 20

Claims 19 and 20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Anderson ("Personal Selling and Sales Management in the New Millennium") in view of Green et al. (U.S. Patent 6,041,310), and official notice. As per claim 19, Anderson discloses a method for purchasing goods, involving a computer station in a dealership, and comprising the step of engaging an interactive display (paragraph beginning, "Computer salespeople," page 11 on printout). Anderson does not expressly disclose a showroom floor having a plurality of goods offered for sale, but official notice is taken that it is well known for car and other dealerships to have showroom floors with a plurality of samples of goods representing the available goods for sale, said samples having selection characteristics. The presence of computer station makes entering the

showroom obvious, for the advantage of using the computer workstation as described by Anderson.

Anderson does not expressly disclose that people engage interactive displays on the computer workstations to which he refers, but Green teaches interactive displays for selecting a good having selection characteristics (column 7, line 25, through column 11, line 65; Figures 6 through 12). Further, official notice is taken that it is well known for computers to have computer readable media containing computer readable instructions for instructing them to do what they do. Hence, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art of electronic commerce at the time of applicant's invention for customers to engage an interactive display having a computer readable medium containing computer readable instructions for selecting and purchasing a good, the good having selection characteristics, for the stated advantage (Green, column 2, lines 14-17) of sifting through the myriad of goods available for purchase.

Green further discloses entering information about preferences to said interactive display responsive to prompts; and viewing a list of the displayed goods displayed according to selection characteristics of the goods and preferences of the customer (column 7, line 25, through column 11, line 65; Figures 6 through 12). Hence, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art of electronic commerce at the time of applicant's invention to do these things, for the stated advantage (Green, column 2, lines 14-17) of sifting through the myriad of goods available for purchase.

Anderson discloses selecting a good for purchase, and strongly implies viewing the amount due according to the good selected (paragraph beginning "Computer

Art Unit: 3625

salespeople"; Anderson discloses that the computer adds the cost of options, compute the monthly payments, and writes up the order, which would be pointless if the customer did not view the information). Anderson does not disclose entering shipping information so that the good selected can be shipped to the customer, but official notice is taken that it is well known to enter shipping information so that the good selected can be shipped to the customer. Hence, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art of electronic commerce at the time of applicant's invention to do so, for the obvious advantage of enabling and arranging shipment of goods.

Green teaches physically evaluating teaches at least one of the samples of goods (column 12, lines 13-15), but does not teach entering the results of the physical evaluation into the interactive display responsive to the instructions. However, Anderson and Green both pertain to showrooms with goods on display (presumably, in the case of Anderson), so it would be easy and natural for a customer to engage in physical evaluation (look at cars, kick the tires, note the size of various vehicles, check that they were free of rust, etc.), and enter the results of the physical evaluation into the interactive display (e.g., by including or excluding a category including a particular vehicle one had seen). Hence, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art of electronic commerce at the time of applicant's invention to physically evaluate at least one of the samples of goods, enter the results of the physical evaluation into the interactive display, and view a list of displayed goods displayed in accordance therewith, for the obvious advantage of sifting through the myriad of goods available for purchase, and finding a product in accordance with one's need and wants.

As per claim 20, Anderson discloses interacting with a call center concerning the selection of a good for sale so that a customer may communicate with remotely located sales personnel (paragraph beginning "Computer salespeople").

Conclusion

The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure. Randle et al. (U.S. Patent 5,774,663) disclose a personal banker customer management system providing interactive video communication in real time concerning banking information. Morohashi et al. (U.S. Patent 6,105,003) disclose a customer data processing system provided in a showroom. Call (U.S. Patent 6,154,738) discloses methods and apparatus from disseminating product information via the Internet using universal product codes. Divine et al. (U.S. Patent 6,339,763) disclose a system and method for visualizing vehicles with accessories.

Wren (U.S. Patent Application Publication 2003/0046186) discloses a system for marketing goods and services utilizing computerized central and remote facilities. Barrott et al. (U.S. Patent Application Publication 2003/0212611) disclose a computerized family advising system and method for making funeral arrangements.

Stütz (or Stuetz if one's typewriter doesn't handle umlauts) (WO 99/46751) discloses a POI and/or POS terminal.

The anonymous article (Abstract only), "Car Superstore Rolling This Way" discloses a showroom with computer terminals and no sales personnel. The anonymous article, "No tires to Kick in Used-Car Superstore customers Use computers

to Browse AutoNation USA's 1,000-Car Lot," discloses what the title summarizes.

Taylor ("Would You Buy a Used Car from This Man?") discloses computer-driven kiosks where customers can get information about cars they want. The anonymous article, "The Best of Both Worlds," discloses a furniture store that integrates in-store and Internet searching and buying.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Nicholas D. Rosen whose telephone number is 703-305-0753. The examiner can normally be reached on 8:30 AM - 5:00 PM, M-F.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Wynn Coggins can be reached on 703-308-1344. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306. Non-official/draft communications can be faxed to the examiner at 703-746-5574.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Nicholas D. Rosen
NICHOLAS D. ROSEN
PRIMARY EXAMINER

December 10, 2004